

Estimating the Parameters of Binomial and Poisson Distributions via Multistage Sampling *

Xinjia Chen

September 2008

Abstract

In this paper, we have developed a new class of sampling schemes for estimating parameters of binomial and Poisson distributions. Without any information of the unknown parameters, our sampling schemes rigorously guarantee prescribed levels of precision and confidence.

1 Introduction

The binomial and Poisson distributions are extremely useful in numerous fields of sciences and engineering. The binomial distribution arises in many different contexts whenever a random variable can be hypothesized to have arisen as the number of occurrences of a certain characteristics or property of interest in a series of independent trials of the random phenomenon. It has been utilized for statistical inferences about dichotomous data for more than 250 years. The Poisson distribution has found an extensive application for a wide variety of phenomena dealing with counts of rare events (see, e.g., [5, 6, 7] and the references therein).

The estimation of the parameters of binomial and Poisson distributions is of practical importance and has been persistent issues of research in statistics and other relevant fields. Despite the richness of literature devoted to such issues, existing approaches suffer from the drawbacks of lacking either efficiency or rigorousness. Such drawbacks are due to conservative bounding or asymptotic approximation involved in the design of sampling schemes (see, e.g., [3] and the references therein). To overcome the limitations of existing methods of estimating the parameters of binomial and Poisson distributions, we would like to propose a new classes of multistage sampling schemes. In contrast to existing methods, our sampling schemes require no information of the unknown parameters and rigorously guarantee prescribed levels of precision and confidence.

*The author had been previously working with Louisiana State University at Baton Rouge, LA 70803, USA, and is now with Department of Electrical Engineering, Southern University and A&M College, Baton Rouge, LA 70813, USA; Email: chenxinjia@gmail.com

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present our multistage sampling schemes for estimating binomial parameters under different precision requirements. Section 3 is devoted to the estimation of Poisson parameters. Section 4 is the conclusion. The proofs of all theorems are given in Appendices.

Throughout this paper, we shall use the following notations. The set of integers is denoted by $\mathbb{Z}$. The ceiling function and floor function are denoted respectively by $\lceil \cdot \rceil$ and $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ (i.e., $\lceil x \rceil$ represents the smallest integer no less than x ; $\lfloor x \rfloor$ represents the largest integer no greater than x). The gamma function is denoted by $\Gamma(\cdot)$. For any integer m , the combinatoric function $\binom{m}{z}$ with respect to integer z takes value $\frac{\Gamma(m+1)}{\Gamma(z+1)\Gamma(m-z+1)}$ for $z \leq m$ and value 0 otherwise. We use the notation $\Pr\{\cdot \mid \theta\}$ to indicate that the associated random samples $X_1, X_2, \dots$ are parameterized by θ . The parameter θ in $\Pr\{\cdot \mid \theta\}$ may be dropped whenever this can be done without introducing confusion. The other notations will be made clear as we proceed.

2 Estimation of Binomial Parameter

Let X be a Bernoulli random variable with distribution $\Pr\{X = 1\} = 1 - \Pr\{X = 0\} = p \in (0, 1)$. It is a frequent problem to estimate p based on i.i.d. random samples $X_1, X_2, \dots$ of X . In this regard, we have developed various sampling schemes by virtue of the following function:

$$S_B(k, l, n, p) = \begin{cases} \sum_{i=k}^l \binom{n}{i} p^i (1-p)^{n-i} & \text{for } p \in (0, 1), \\ 0 & \text{for } p \notin (0, 1). \end{cases}$$

2.1 Control of Absolute Error

To construct an estimator satisfying an absolute error criterion with a prescribed confidence level, we have

Theorem 1 *Let $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}$, $0 < \delta < 1$, $\zeta > 0$ and $\rho > 0$. Let $n_1 < n_2 < \dots < n_s$ be the ascending arrangement of all distinct elements of $\left\{ \left\lceil \left(\frac{2\varepsilon^2}{\ln \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}} \right)^{1-\frac{1}{\tau}} \frac{\ln \frac{1}{\zeta\delta}}{2\varepsilon^2} \right\rceil : i = 0, 1, \dots, \tau \right\}$ with $\tau = \left\lceil \frac{\ln(\frac{1}{2\varepsilon^2} \ln \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon})}{\ln(1+\rho)} \right\rceil$. Define $K_\ell = \sum_{i=1}^{n_\ell} X_i$ and $\hat{p}_\ell = \frac{K_\ell}{n_\ell}$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, s$. Suppose the stopping rule is that sampling is continued until $S_B(K_\ell, n_\ell, n_\ell, \hat{p}_\ell - \varepsilon) \leq \zeta\delta$ and $S_B(0, K_\ell, n_\ell, \hat{p}_\ell + \varepsilon) \leq \zeta\delta$ for some $\ell \in \{1, \dots, s\}$. Let $\hat{p} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i}{n}$ where n is the sample size when the sampling is terminated. Then, $\Pr\{|\hat{p} - p| < \varepsilon \mid p\} \geq 1 - \delta$ for any $p \in (0, 1)$ provided that $0 < \zeta \leq \frac{1}{2(\tau+1)}$.*

We would like to note that if we define

$$\mathcal{Q}^+ = \bigcup_{\ell=1}^s \left\{ \frac{k}{n_\ell} + \varepsilon \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right) : k \in \mathbb{Z} \right\} \cup \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \right\}, \quad \mathcal{Q}^- = \bigcup_{\ell=1}^s \left\{ \frac{k}{n_\ell} - \varepsilon \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right) : k \in \mathbb{Z} \right\} \cup \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \right\}.$$

and decision variables D_ℓ such that $D_\ell = 1$ if

$$S_B(K_\ell, n_\ell, n_\ell, \hat{p}_\ell - \varepsilon) \leq \zeta\delta, \quad S_B(0, K_\ell, n_\ell, \hat{p}_\ell + \varepsilon) \leq \zeta\delta;$$

and $\mathbf{D}_\ell = 0$ otherwise, then a sufficient condition to guarantee $\Pr\{|\hat{\mathbf{p}} - p| < \varepsilon \mid p\} > 1 - \delta$ for any $p \in (0, 1)$ is that

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^s \Pr\{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_\ell \geq p + \varepsilon, \mathbf{D}_{\ell-1} = 0, \mathbf{D}_\ell = 1 \mid p\} < \frac{\delta}{2} \quad \forall p \in \mathcal{Q}^-, \quad (1)$$

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^s \Pr\{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_\ell \leq p - \varepsilon, \mathbf{D}_{\ell-1} = 0, \mathbf{D}_\ell = 1 \mid p\} < \frac{\delta}{2} \quad \forall p \in \mathcal{Q}^+ \quad (2)$$

where both (1) and (2) are satisfied if $0 < \zeta < \frac{1}{2(\tau+1)}$. Here we have used the double-decision-variable method of [1]. To determine a ζ as large as possible and thus make the sampling scheme most efficient, the computational techniques such as bisection confidence tuning, domain truncation, triangular partition developed in [1, 2] can be applied.

2.2 Control of Relative Error

To construct an estimator satisfying a relative error criterion with a prescribed confidence level, we have

Theorem 2 *Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, $0 < \delta < 1$, $\zeta > 0$ and $\rho > 0$. Define $\nu = \frac{\varepsilon}{(1+\varepsilon)\ln(1+\varepsilon)-\varepsilon}$ and $\tau = \left\lceil \frac{\ln(1+\nu)}{\ln(1+\rho)} \right\rceil$. Let $\gamma_1 < \gamma_2 < \dots < \gamma_s$ be the ascending arrangement of all distinct elements of $\left\{ \left\lceil (1+\nu)^{\frac{i}{\tau}} \frac{\ln \frac{1}{\zeta\delta}}{\ln(1+\varepsilon)} \right\rceil : i = 0, 1, \dots, \tau \right\}$. For $\ell = 1, \dots, s$, let $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_\ell = \frac{\gamma_\ell}{\mathbf{n}_\ell}$ where $\mathbf{n}_\ell$ is the minimum number of samples such that $\sum_{i=1}^{\mathbf{n}_\ell} X_i = \gamma_\ell$. Suppose the stopping rule is that sampling is continued until $S_B\left(\gamma_\ell, \mathbf{n}_\ell, \mathbf{n}_\ell, \frac{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_\ell}{1+\varepsilon}\right) \leq \zeta\delta$ and $S_B\left(0, \gamma_\ell, \mathbf{n}_\ell, \frac{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_\ell}{1-\varepsilon}\right) \leq \zeta\delta$ for some $\ell \in \{1, \dots, s\}$. Define estimator $\hat{\mathbf{p}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{\mathbf{n}} X_i}{\mathbf{n}}$ where $\mathbf{n}$ is the sample size when the sampling is terminated. Then, $\Pr\left\{\left|\frac{\hat{\mathbf{p}}-p}{p}\right| < \varepsilon \mid p\right\} \geq 1 - \delta$ for any $p \in (0, 1)$ provided that $0 < \zeta \leq \frac{1}{2(\tau+1)}$.*

In this section, we have proposed a multistage inverse sampling plan for estimating a binomial parameter, p , with relative precision. In some situations, the cost of sampling operation may be high since samples are obtained one by one when inverse sampling is involved. In view of this fact, it is desirable to develop multistage estimation methods without using inverse sampling. For this purpose, we have

Theorem 3 *Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, $0 < \delta < 1$ and $\zeta > 0$. Let τ be a positive integer. For $\ell = 1, 2, \dots$, define $K_\ell = \sum_{i=1}^{n_\ell} X_i$, $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_\ell = \frac{K_\ell}{n_\ell}$, where n_ℓ is deterministic and stands for the sample size at the ℓ -th stage. Suppose the stopping rule is that sampling is continued until $S_B\left(K_\ell, n_\ell, n_\ell, \frac{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_\ell}{1+\varepsilon}\right) \leq \zeta\delta_\ell$ and $S_B\left(0, K_\ell, n_\ell, \frac{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_\ell}{1-\varepsilon}\right) \leq \zeta\delta_\ell$ for some ℓ , where $\delta_\ell = \delta$ for $1 \leq \ell \leq \tau$ and $\delta_\ell = \delta 2^{\tau-\ell}$ for $\ell > \tau$. Define estimator $\hat{\mathbf{p}} = \hat{\mathbf{p}}_{\mathbf{l}}$, where $\mathbf{l}$ is the index of stage at which the sampling is terminated. Then, $\Pr\{\mathbf{l} < \infty\} = 1$ and $\Pr\left\{\left|\frac{\hat{\mathbf{p}}-p}{p}\right| \leq \varepsilon \mid p\right\} \geq 1 - \delta$ for any $p \in (0, 1)$ provided that $2(\tau+1)\zeta \leq 1$ and $\inf_{\ell>0} \frac{n_{\ell+1}}{n_\ell} > 0$.*

2.3 Control of Absolute and Relative Errors

To construct an estimator satisfying a mixed criterion in terms of absolute and relative errors with a prescribed confidence level, we have

Theorem 4 Let $0 < \delta < 1$, $\zeta > 0$ and $\rho > 0$. Let ε_a and ε_r be positive numbers such that $0 < \varepsilon_a < \frac{35}{94}$ and $\frac{70\varepsilon_a}{35-24\varepsilon_a} < \varepsilon_r < 1$. Define $\nu = \frac{\varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_r \varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_r}{\varepsilon_r \ln(1+\varepsilon_r)} \ln \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon_r^2}{\varepsilon_r - \varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_r \varepsilon_a} \right)$ and $\tau = \left\lfloor \frac{\ln(1+\nu)}{\ln(1+\rho)} \right\rfloor$. Let $n_1 < n_2 < \dots < n_s$ be the ascending arrangement of all distinct elements of $\left\{ \left[(1+\nu)^{\frac{1}{\tau}} \frac{\ln \frac{1}{\zeta \delta}}{\ln(1+\varepsilon_r)} \right] : \tau \leq i \leq 0 \right\}$. Define $K_\ell = \sum_{i=1}^{n_\ell} X_i$, $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_\ell = \frac{K_\ell}{n_\ell}$, $\underline{\mathbf{p}}_\ell = \min\{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_\ell - \varepsilon_a, \frac{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_\ell}{1+\varepsilon_r}\}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{p}}_\ell = \max\{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_\ell + \varepsilon_a, \frac{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_\ell}{1-\varepsilon_r}\}$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, s$. Suppose the stopping rule is that sampling is continued until $S_B(K_\ell, n_\ell, n_\ell, \underline{\mathbf{p}}_\ell) \leq \zeta \delta$ and $S_B(0, K_\ell, n_\ell, \bar{\mathbf{p}}_\ell) \leq \zeta \delta$ for some $\ell \in \{1, \dots, s\}$. Let $\hat{\mathbf{p}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{\mathbf{n}} X_i}{\mathbf{n}}$ where $\mathbf{n}$ is the sample size when the sampling is terminated. Then, $\Pr\left\{|\hat{\mathbf{p}} - p| < \varepsilon_a \text{ or } \left| \frac{\hat{\mathbf{p}} - p}{p} \right| < \varepsilon_r \mid p\right\} \geq 1 - \delta$ for any $p \in (0, 1)$ provided that $0 < \zeta \leq \frac{1}{2(1-\tau)}$.

3 Estimation of Poisson Parameter

Let X be a Poisson random variable with mean value $\lambda > 0$. It is an important problem to estimate λ based on i.i.d. random samples $X_1, X_2, \dots$ of X . In this regard, we have developed a sampling scheme by virtue of the following function:

$$S_P(k, l, n, \lambda) = \begin{cases} \sum_{i=k}^l \frac{(n\lambda)^i e^{-n\lambda}}{i!} & \text{for } \lambda > 0, \\ 0 & \text{for } \lambda \leq 0. \end{cases}$$

As can be seen at below, our sampling scheme produces an estimator satisfying a mixed criterion in terms of absolute and relative errors with a prescribed confidence level.

Theorem 5 Let $0 < \varepsilon_a < 1$, $0 < \varepsilon_r < 1$, $0 < \delta < 1$, $\zeta > 0$ and $\rho > 0$. Let $n_1 < n_2 < \dots < n_s$ be the ascending arrangement of all distinct elements of $\left\{ \left\lceil \nu^{\frac{1}{\tau}} \ln \frac{1}{\zeta \delta} \right\rceil : i = 0, 1, \dots, \tau \right\}$ with $\nu = \frac{\varepsilon_r}{\varepsilon_a[(1+\varepsilon_r)\ln(1+\varepsilon_r) - \varepsilon_r]}$ and $\tau = \left\lceil \frac{\ln \nu}{\ln(1+\rho)} \right\rceil$. Define $K_\ell = \sum_{i=1}^{n_\ell} X_i$, $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_\ell = \frac{K_\ell}{n_\ell}$, $\bar{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_\ell = \max\left\{\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_\ell + \varepsilon_a, \frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_\ell}{1-\varepsilon_r}\right\}$ and $\underline{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_\ell = \min\left\{\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_\ell - \varepsilon_a, \frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_\ell}{1+\varepsilon_r}\right\}$ for $\ell \in \{1, \dots, s\}$. Suppose the stopping rule is that sampling is continued until $S_P(0, K_\ell - 1, n_\ell, \underline{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_\ell) \geq 1 - \zeta \delta$ and $S_P(0, K_\ell, n_\ell, \bar{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_\ell) \leq \zeta \delta$ for some $\ell \in \{1, \dots, s\}$. Let $\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{\mathbf{n}} X_i}{\mathbf{n}}$ where $\mathbf{n}$ is the sample size when the sampling is terminated. Then, $\Pr\{|\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} - \lambda| < \varepsilon_a \text{ or } |\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} - \lambda| < \varepsilon_r \lambda \mid \lambda\} \geq 1 - \delta$ for any $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$ provided that $0 < \zeta \leq \frac{1}{2(\tau+1)}$.

For the purpose of estimating Poisson parameter, λ , with an absolute precision, we have

Theorem 6 Let $\varepsilon > 0$, $0 < \delta < 1$ and $\zeta > 0$. Let τ be a positive integer. For $\ell = 1, 2, \dots$, define $K_\ell = \sum_{i=1}^{n_\ell} X_i$, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_\ell = \frac{K_\ell}{n_\ell}$, where n_ℓ is deterministic and stands for the sample size at the ℓ -th stage. Suppose the stopping rule is that sampling is continued until $S_P(0, K_\ell - 1, n_\ell, \hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_\ell - \varepsilon) \geq 1 - \zeta \delta_\ell$ and $S_P(0, K_\ell, n_\ell, \hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_\ell + \varepsilon) \leq \zeta \delta_\ell$ for some ℓ , where $\delta_\ell = \delta$ for $1 \leq \ell \leq \tau$ and $\delta_\ell = \delta 2^{\tau-\ell}$ for $\ell > \tau$. Define estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\mathbf{l}}$, where $\mathbf{l}$ is the index of stage at which the sampling is terminated. Then,

$\Pr\{\mathbf{l} < \infty\} = 1$ and $\Pr\left\{\left|\hat{\lambda} - \lambda\right| \leq \varepsilon \mid \lambda\right\} \geq 1 - \delta$ for any $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$ provided that $2(\tau + 1)\zeta \leq 1$ and $\inf_{\ell > 0} \frac{n_{\ell+1}}{n_{\ell}} > 0$.

For the purpose of estimating Poisson parameter, λ , with a relative precision, we have

Theorem 7 *Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, $0 < \delta < 1$ and $\zeta > 0$. Let τ be a positive integer. For $\ell = 1, 2, \dots$, define $K_{\ell} = \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\ell}} X_i$, $\hat{\lambda}_{\ell} = \frac{K_{\ell}}{n_{\ell}}$, where n_{ℓ} is deterministic and stands for the sample size at the ℓ -th stage. Suppose the stopping rule is that sampling is continued until $S_P\left(0, K_{\ell} - 1, n_{\ell}, \frac{\hat{\lambda}_{\ell}}{1+\varepsilon}\right) \geq 1 - \zeta\delta_{\ell}$ and $S_P\left(0, K_{\ell}, n_{\ell}, \frac{\hat{\lambda}_{\ell}}{1-\varepsilon}\right) \leq \zeta\delta_{\ell}$ for some ℓ , where $\delta_{\ell} = \delta$ for $1 \leq \ell \leq \tau$ and $\delta_{\ell} = \delta 2^{\tau-\ell}$ for $\ell > \tau$. Define estimator $\hat{\lambda} = \hat{\lambda}_{\mathbf{l}}$, where $\mathbf{l}$ is the index of stage at which the sampling is terminated. Then, $\Pr\{\mathbf{l} < \infty\} = 1$ and $\Pr\left\{\left|\frac{\hat{\lambda} - \lambda}{\lambda}\right| \leq \varepsilon \mid \lambda\right\} \geq 1 - \delta$ for any $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$ provided that $2(\tau + 1)\zeta \leq 1$ and $\inf_{\ell > 0} \frac{n_{\ell+1}}{n_{\ell}} > 0$.*

Again, as we mentioned after the presentation of Theorem 1, we would like to note that the computational techniques such as the double-decision-variable method, bisection confidence tuning, domain truncation, triangular partition developed in [1, 2] can be applied to reduce the conservatism of the sampling schemes described by Theorems 2 to 7.

With regard to the tightness of the double-decision-variable method, we can develop results similar to Theorems 8, 13, 18 and 22 of [1].

With regard to the asymptotic performance of our sampling schemes, we can develop results similar to Theorems 9, 14, 19 and 23 of [1].

4 Conclusion

In this paper, we have developed new multistage sampling schemes for estimating the parameters of binomial and Poisson distributions. Our new methods rigorously guarantee prescribed levels of precision and confidence.

A Proof of Theorem 1

In the course of proof, we need to use function

$$\mathcal{M}_B(z, \mu) = \begin{cases} z \ln \frac{\mu}{z} + (1 - z) \ln \frac{1-\mu}{1-z} & \text{for } z \in (0, 1) \text{ and } \mu \in (0, 1), \\ \ln(1 - \mu) & \text{for } z = 0 \text{ and } \mu \in (0, 1), \\ \ln \mu & \text{for } z = 1 \text{ and } \mu \in (0, 1), \\ -\infty & \text{for } z \in [0, 1] \text{ and } \mu \notin (0, 1). \end{cases}$$

We need some preliminary results. The following classical result is due to Hoeffding [4].

Lemma 1 Let $\bar{X}_n = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i}{n}$ where $X_1, \dots, X_n$ are i.i.d. random variables such that $0 \leq X_i \leq 1$ and $\mathbb{E}[X_i] = \mu \in (0, 1)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then, $\Pr\{\bar{X}_n \geq z\} \leq \exp(n\mathcal{M}_B(z, \mu))$ for any $z \in (\mu, 1)$. Similarly, $\Pr\{\bar{X}_n \leq z\} \leq \exp(n\mathcal{M}_B(z, \mu))$ for any $z \in (0, \mu)$.

The following lemma can be readily derived from Lemma 1.

Lemma 2 $S_B(0, k, n, p) \leq \exp(n\mathcal{M}_B(\frac{k}{n}, p))$ for $0 \leq k \leq np$. Similarly, $S_B(k, n, n, p) \leq \exp(n\mathcal{M}_B(\frac{k}{n}, p))$ for $np \leq k \leq n$.

Lemma 3 Let $K = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ where $X_1, \dots, X_n$ are i.i.d. Bernoulli random variables such that $\Pr\{X_i = 1\} = 1 - \Pr\{X_i = 0\} = p \in (0, 1)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then, $\Pr\{S_B(0, K, n, p) \leq \alpha\} \leq \alpha$ for any $\alpha > 0$.

Proof. If $\{S_B(0, K, n, p) \leq \alpha\}$ is an impossible event, then $\Pr\{S_B(0, K, n, p) \leq \alpha\} = 0 < \alpha$. Otherwise, if $\{S_B(0, K, n, p) \leq \alpha\}$ is a possible event, then there exists an integer $k^* = \max\{k : 0 \leq k \leq n, S_B(0, k, n, p) \leq \alpha\}$ and it follows that $\Pr\{S_B(0, K, n, p) \leq \alpha\} = S_B(0, k^*, n, p) \leq \alpha$. The proof is thus completed. $\square$

Lemma 4 Let $K = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ where $X_1, \dots, X_n$ are i.i.d. Bernoulli random variables such that $\Pr\{X_i = 1\} = 1 - \Pr\{X_i = 0\} = p \in (0, 1)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then, $\Pr\{S_B(K, n, n, p) \leq \alpha\} \leq \alpha$ for any $\alpha > 0$.

Proof. If $\{S_B(K, n, n, p) \leq \alpha\}$ is an impossible event, then $\Pr\{S_B(K, n, n, p) \leq \alpha\} = 0 < \alpha$. Otherwise, if $\{S_B(K, n, n, p) \leq \alpha\}$ is a possible event, then there exists an integer $k_* = \min\{k : 0 \leq k \leq n, S_B(k, n, n, p) \leq \alpha\}$ and it follows that $\Pr\{S_B(K, n, n, p) \leq \alpha\} = S_B(k_*, n, n, p) \leq \alpha$. The proof is thus completed. $\square$

Lemma 5 Both $\mathcal{M}_B(z, z - \varepsilon)$ and $\mathcal{M}_B(z, z + \varepsilon)$ are no greater than $-2\varepsilon^2$ for $0 \leq z \leq 1$.

Lemma 6 $\Pr\{S_B(K_s, n_s, n_s, \hat{\mathbf{p}}_s - \varepsilon) \leq \zeta\delta\} = \Pr\{S_B(0, K_s, n_s, \hat{\mathbf{p}}_s + \varepsilon) \leq \zeta\delta\} = 1$.

Proof. By the definition of sample sizes, we have $n_s = \left\lceil \frac{\ln(\zeta\delta)}{-2\varepsilon^2} \right\rceil \geq \frac{\ln(\zeta\delta)}{-2\varepsilon^2}$ and consequently $\frac{\ln(\zeta\delta)}{n_s} \geq -2\varepsilon^2$. By Lemmas 2 and 5, we have

$$\Pr\{S_B(K_s, n_s, n_s, \hat{\mathbf{p}}_s - \varepsilon) \leq \zeta\delta\} \geq \Pr\left\{\mathcal{M}_B(\hat{\mathbf{p}}_s, \hat{\mathbf{p}}_s - \varepsilon) \leq \frac{\ln(\zeta\delta)}{n_s}\right\} \geq \Pr\{\mathcal{M}_B(\hat{\mathbf{p}}_s, \hat{\mathbf{p}}_s - \varepsilon) \leq -2\varepsilon^2\} = 1,$$

$$\Pr\{S_B(0, K_s, n_s, \hat{\mathbf{p}}_s + \varepsilon) \leq \zeta\delta\} \geq \Pr\left\{\mathcal{M}_B(\hat{\mathbf{p}}_s, \hat{\mathbf{p}}_s + \varepsilon) \leq \frac{\ln(\zeta\delta)}{n_s}\right\} \geq \Pr\{\mathcal{M}_B(\hat{\mathbf{p}}_s, \hat{\mathbf{p}}_s + \varepsilon) \leq -2\varepsilon^2\} = 1$$

which immediately implies the lemma. $\square$

Lemma 7 $\Pr\{p \leq \hat{\mathbf{p}}_\ell - \varepsilon, S_B(K_\ell, n_\ell, n_\ell, \hat{\mathbf{p}}_\ell - \varepsilon) \leq \zeta\delta\} \leq \zeta\delta$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, s$.

Proof. Since $S_B(k, n, n, p)$ is monotonically increasing with respect to $p \in (0, 1)$, we have $\{p \leq \hat{p}_\ell - \varepsilon, S_B(K_\ell, n_\ell, n_\ell, \hat{p}_\ell - \varepsilon) \leq \zeta\delta\} \subseteq \{S_B(K_\ell, n_\ell, n_\ell, p) \leq \zeta\delta\}$. Hence, by Lemma 4, we have

$$\Pr\{p \leq \hat{p}_\ell - \varepsilon, S_B(K_\ell, n_\ell, n_\ell, \hat{p}_\ell - \varepsilon) \leq \zeta\delta\} \leq \Pr\{S_B(K_\ell, n_\ell, n_\ell, p) \leq \zeta\delta\} \leq \zeta\delta$$

for $\ell = 1, \dots, s$. □

Lemma 8 $\Pr\{p \geq \hat{p}_\ell + \varepsilon, S_B(0, K_\ell, n_\ell, \hat{p}_\ell + \varepsilon) \leq \zeta\delta\} \leq \zeta\delta$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, s$.

Proof. Since $S_B(0, k, n, p)$ is monotonically decreasing with respect to $p \in (0, 1)$, we have $\{p \geq \hat{p}_\ell + \varepsilon, S_B(0, K_\ell, n_\ell, \hat{p}_\ell + \varepsilon) \leq \zeta\delta\} \subseteq \{S_B(0, K_\ell, n_\ell, p) \leq \zeta\delta\}$. Hence, by Lemma 3, we have

$$\Pr\{p \geq \hat{p}_\ell + \varepsilon, S_B(0, K_\ell, n_\ell, \hat{p}_\ell + \varepsilon) \leq \zeta\delta\} \leq \Pr\{S_B(0, K_\ell, n_\ell, p) \leq \zeta\delta\} \leq \zeta\delta$$

for $\ell = 1, \dots, s$. □

Now we are in a position to prove Theorem 1. As a direct consequence of $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, we have $\ln \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} > 2\varepsilon^2$ and thus $\tau \geq 1$. This shows that the sample sizes $n_1, \dots, n_s$ are well-defined. By Lemma 6, the sampling must stop at some stage with index $\ell \in \{1, \dots, s\}$. Therefore, the sampling scheme is well-defined. By Lemmas 7, 8 and the definition of the stopping rule, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\{|\hat{p} - p| \geq \varepsilon\} &= \Pr\{p \leq \hat{p} - \varepsilon\} + \Pr\{p \geq \hat{p} + \varepsilon\} \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell=1}^s \Pr\{p \leq \hat{p}_\ell - \varepsilon, S_B(K_\ell, n_\ell, n_\ell, \hat{p}_\ell - \varepsilon) \leq \zeta\delta\} \\ &\quad + \sum_{\ell=1}^s \Pr\{p \geq \hat{p}_\ell + \varepsilon, S_B(0, K_\ell, n_\ell, \hat{p}_\ell + \varepsilon) \leq \zeta\delta\} \\ &\leq s\zeta\delta + s\zeta\delta = 2s\zeta\delta \leq 2(\tau + 1)\delta, \end{aligned}$$

from which it can be seen that $\Pr\{|\hat{p} - p| < \varepsilon\} > 1 - \delta$ if $0 < \zeta < \frac{1}{2(\tau+1)}$. This concludes the proof of Theorem 1.

B Proof of Theorem 2

Lemma 9 Let γ be a positive integer. Let $\mathbf{n}$ be the minimum integer such that $\sum_{i=1}^{\mathbf{n}} X_i = \gamma$ where $X_1, X_2, \dots$ is a sequence of i.i.d. Bernoulli random variables such that $\Pr\{X_i = 1\} = 1 - \Pr\{X_i = 0\} = p \in (0, 1)$ for any positive integer i . Then, $\Pr\{S_B(0, \gamma, \mathbf{n}, p) \leq \alpha\} \leq \alpha$ for any $\alpha > 0$.

Proof. Since $\Pr\{\mathbf{n} \geq m\} = S_B(0, \gamma, m, p)$ and $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \Pr\{\mathbf{n} \geq m\} = 0$, there exists an integer $m^* \geq r$ such that $S_B(0, \gamma, m, p) \leq \alpha$ for any integer $m \geq m^*$ and that $S_B(0, \gamma, m, p) > \alpha$ for $r \leq m < m^*$. Hence, $\Pr\{S_B(0, \gamma, \mathbf{n}, p) \leq \alpha\} = \Pr\{\mathbf{n} \geq m^*\} = S_B(0, \gamma, m^*, p) \leq \alpha$. $\square$

Lemma 10 *Let γ be a positive integer. Let $\mathbf{n}$ be the minimum integer such that $\sum_{i=1}^{\mathbf{n}} X_i = \gamma$ where $X_1, X_2, \dots$ is a sequence of i.i.d. Bernoulli random variables such that $\Pr\{X_i = 1\} = 1 - \Pr\{X_i = 0\} = p \in (0, 1)$ for any positive integer i . Then, $\Pr\{S_B(\gamma, \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{n}, p) \leq \alpha\} \leq \alpha$ for any $\alpha > 0$.*

Proof. Note that $\Pr\{\mathbf{n} \leq m\} = S_B(\gamma, m, m, p)$. In the case that $S_B(\gamma, \gamma, \gamma, p) > \alpha$, we have $S_B(\gamma, m, m, p) \geq S_B(\gamma, \gamma, \gamma, p) > \alpha$ for any integer $m \geq \gamma$. Thus, $\Pr\{S_B(\gamma, \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{n}, p) \leq \alpha\} = 0 < \alpha$. In the case that $S_B(\gamma, \gamma, \gamma, p) \leq \alpha$, there exists an integer m^* such that $S_B(\gamma, m, m, p) > \alpha$ for any integer $m > m^*$ and that $S_B(\gamma, m, m, p) \leq \alpha$ for $\gamma \leq m \leq m^*$. Hence, $\Pr\{S_B(\gamma, \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{n}, p) \leq \alpha\} = \Pr\{\mathbf{n} \leq m^*\} = S_B(\gamma, m^*, m^*, p) \leq \alpha$. $\square$

Now we need to introduce function

$$\mathcal{M}_I(z, \mu) = \begin{cases} \ln \frac{\mu}{z} + \left(\frac{1}{z} - 1\right) \ln \frac{1-\mu}{1-z} & \text{for } z \in (0, 1) \text{ and } \mu \in (0, 1), \\ \ln \mu & \text{for } z = 1 \text{ and } \mu \in (0, 1), \\ -\infty & \text{for } z = 0 \text{ and } \mu \in (0, 1), \\ -\infty & \text{for } z \in [0, 1] \text{ and } \mu \notin (0, 1). \end{cases}$$

The following results, stated as Lemmas 11 and 12, have been established by Chen in [1].

Lemma 11 *Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. Then, $\mathcal{M}_I\left(z, \frac{z}{1+\varepsilon}\right)$ is monotonically decreasing with respect to $z \in (0, 1)$.*

Lemma 12 $\mathcal{M}_I\left(z, \frac{z}{1+\varepsilon}\right) > \mathcal{M}_I\left(z, \frac{z}{1-\varepsilon}\right)$ for $0 < z < 1 - \varepsilon < 1$.

Lemma 13 $\Pr\left\{S_B\left(\gamma_s, \mathbf{n}_s, \mathbf{n}_s, \frac{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_s}{1+\varepsilon}\right) \leq \zeta\delta\right\} = \Pr\left\{S_B\left(0, \gamma_s, \mathbf{n}_s, \frac{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_s}{1-\varepsilon}\right) \leq \zeta\delta\right\} = 1$.

Proof. By Lemma 2,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\left\{S_B\left(\gamma_s, \mathbf{n}_s, \mathbf{n}_s, \frac{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_s}{1+\varepsilon}\right) \leq \zeta\delta\right\} &\geq \Pr\left\{\mathbf{n}_s \mathcal{M}_B\left(\frac{\gamma_s}{\mathbf{n}_s}, \frac{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_s}{1+\varepsilon}\right) \leq \ln(\zeta\delta)\right\} \\ &= \Pr\left\{\frac{\gamma_s}{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_s} \mathcal{M}_B\left(\hat{\mathbf{p}}_s, \frac{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_s}{1+\varepsilon}\right) \leq \ln(\zeta\delta)\right\} \\ &= \Pr\left\{\mathcal{M}_I\left(\hat{\mathbf{p}}_s, \frac{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_s}{1+\varepsilon}\right) \leq \frac{\ln(\zeta\delta)}{\gamma_s}\right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Making use of Lemma 11 and the fact $\lim_{z \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{M}_I\left(z, \frac{z}{1+\varepsilon}\right) = \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon} - \ln(1+\varepsilon)$, we have $\mathcal{M}_I\left(z, \frac{z}{1+\varepsilon}\right) < \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon} - \ln(1+\varepsilon)$ for any $z \in (0, 1]$. Consequently, $\left\{\mathcal{M}_I\left(\hat{\mathbf{p}}_s, \frac{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_s}{1+\varepsilon}\right) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon} - \ln(1+\varepsilon)\right\}$ is a sure event because $0 < \hat{\mathbf{p}}_s(\omega) \leq 1$ for any $\omega \in \Omega$. By the definition of γ_s , we have

$$\gamma_s = \left\lceil \frac{\ln(\zeta\delta)}{\frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon} - \ln(1+\varepsilon)} \right\rceil \geq \frac{\ln(\zeta\delta)}{\frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon} - \ln(1+\varepsilon)}.$$

Since $\frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon} - \ln(1+\varepsilon) < 0$ for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, we have $\frac{\ln(\zeta\delta)}{\gamma_s} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon} - \ln(1+\varepsilon)$. Hence,

$$\Pr\left\{\mathcal{M}_I\left(\hat{\mathbf{p}}_s, \frac{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_s}{1+\varepsilon}\right) \leq \frac{\ln(\zeta\delta)}{\gamma_s}\right\} \geq \Pr\left\{\mathcal{M}_I\left(\hat{\mathbf{p}}_s, \frac{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_s}{1+\varepsilon}\right) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon} - \ln(1+\varepsilon)\right\} = 1. \quad (4)$$

Combining (3) and (4) yields $\Pr\left\{S_B\left(\gamma_s, \mathbf{n}_s, \mathbf{n}_s, \frac{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_s}{1+\varepsilon}\right) \leq \zeta\delta\right\} = 1$.

Similarly, by Lemmas 2 and 12,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\geq \Pr\left\{S_B\left(0, \gamma_s, \mathbf{n}_s, \frac{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_s}{1-\varepsilon}\right) \leq \zeta\delta\right\} && \geq \Pr\left\{\mathbf{n}_s \mathcal{M}_B\left(\frac{\gamma_s}{\mathbf{n}_s}, \frac{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_s}{1-\varepsilon}\right) \leq \ln(\zeta\delta)\right\} \\ & && = \Pr\left\{\frac{\gamma_s}{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_s} \mathcal{M}_B\left(\hat{\mathbf{p}}_s, \frac{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_s}{1-\varepsilon}\right) \leq \ln(\zeta\delta)\right\} \\ & && = \Pr\left\{\mathcal{M}_I\left(\hat{\mathbf{p}}_s, \frac{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_s}{1-\varepsilon}\right) \leq \frac{\ln(\zeta\delta)}{\gamma_s}\right\} \\ & && \geq \Pr\left\{\mathcal{M}_I\left(\hat{\mathbf{p}}_s, \frac{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_s}{1+\varepsilon}\right) \leq \frac{\ln(\zeta\delta)}{\gamma_s}\right\} = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. □

By a similar argument as that of Lemma 7, we have Lemma 14 as follows.

Lemma 14 $\Pr\left\{p \leq \frac{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_\ell}{1+\varepsilon}, S_B\left(\gamma_\ell, \mathbf{n}_\ell, \mathbf{n}_\ell, \frac{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_\ell}{1+\varepsilon}\right) \leq \zeta\delta\right\} \leq \zeta\delta$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, s$.

By a similar argument as that of Lemma 8, we have Lemma 15 as follows.

Lemma 15 $\Pr\left\{p \geq \frac{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_\ell}{1-\varepsilon}, S_B\left(0, \gamma_\ell, \mathbf{n}_\ell, \frac{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_\ell}{1-\varepsilon}\right) \leq \zeta\delta\right\} \leq \zeta\delta$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, s$.

Now we are in a position to prove Theorem 2. Since $\ln(1+\varepsilon) > \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}$ for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, we have $\nu > 0$ and thus $\tau \geq 1$. This shows that the sample sizes $n_1, \dots, n_s$ are well-defined. By Lemma 13, the sampling must stop at some stage with index $\ell \in \{1, \dots, s\}$. Therefore, the sampling scheme is well-defined. By Lemmas 14, 15 and the definition of the stopping rule, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\{|\hat{\mathbf{p}} - p| \geq \varepsilon\} &= \Pr\{p \leq \hat{\mathbf{p}}/(1+\varepsilon)\} + \Pr\{p \geq \hat{\mathbf{p}}/(1-\varepsilon)\} \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell=1}^s \Pr\{p \leq \hat{\mathbf{p}}_\ell/(1+\varepsilon), S_B(K_\ell, n_\ell, n_\ell, \hat{\mathbf{p}}_\ell/(1+\varepsilon)) \leq \zeta\delta\} \\ &\quad + \sum_{\ell=1}^s \Pr\{p \geq \hat{\mathbf{p}}_\ell/(1-\varepsilon), S_B(0, K_\ell, n_\ell, \hat{\mathbf{p}}_\ell/(1-\varepsilon)) \leq \zeta\delta\} \\ &\leq s\zeta\delta + s\zeta\delta = 2s\zeta\delta \leq 2(\tau+1)\delta, \end{aligned}$$

from which it can be seen that $\Pr\{|\hat{\mathbf{p}} - p| < \varepsilon p\} > 1 - \delta$ if $0 < \zeta < \frac{1}{2(\tau+1)}$. This concludes the proof of Theorem 2.

C Proof of Theorem 4

The following result, stated as Lemma 16, has been established by Chen in [1].

Lemma 16 $\Pr \left\{ \mathcal{M}_B \left(\hat{\mathbf{p}}_s, \underline{\mathbf{p}}_s \right) \leq \frac{\ln(\zeta\delta)}{n_s}, \mathcal{M}_B \left(\hat{\mathbf{p}}_s, \bar{\mathbf{p}}_s \right) \leq \frac{\ln(\zeta\delta)}{n_s} \right\} = 1.$

Lemma 17 $\Pr \{ S_B(K_s, n_s, n_s, \underline{\mathbf{p}}_s) \leq \zeta\delta \} = \Pr \{ S_B(0, K_s, n_s, \bar{\mathbf{p}}_s) \leq \zeta\delta \} = 1.$

Proof. By Lemmas 2 and 16,

$$1 \geq \Pr \left\{ S_B(K_s, n_s, n_s, \underline{\mathbf{p}}_s) \leq \zeta\delta \right\} \geq \Pr \left\{ n_s \mathcal{M}_B \left(\hat{\mathbf{p}}_s, \underline{\mathbf{p}}_s \right) \leq \ln(\zeta\delta) \right\} = 1,$$

$$1 \geq \Pr \left\{ S_B(0, K_s, n_s, \bar{\mathbf{p}}_s) \leq \zeta\delta \right\} \geq \Pr \left\{ n_s \mathcal{M}_B \left(\hat{\mathbf{p}}_s, \bar{\mathbf{p}}_s \right) \leq \ln(\zeta\delta) \right\} = 1.$$

The lemma immediately follows. $\square$

By a similar argument as that of Lemma 7, we have Lemma 18 as follows.

Lemma 18 $\Pr \{ p \leq \underline{\mathbf{p}}_\ell, S_B(K_\ell, n_\ell, n_\ell, \underline{\mathbf{p}}_\ell) \leq \zeta\delta \} \leq \zeta\delta$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, s$.

By a similar argument as that of Lemma 8, we have Lemma 19 as follows.

Lemma 19 $\Pr \{ p \geq \bar{\mathbf{p}}_\ell, S_B(0, K_\ell, n_\ell, \bar{\mathbf{p}}_\ell) \leq \zeta\delta \} \leq \zeta\delta$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, s$.

Now we are in a position to prove Theorem 4. By the assumption that $0 < \varepsilon_a < \frac{35}{94}$ and $\frac{70\varepsilon_a}{35-24\varepsilon_a} < \varepsilon_r < 1$, we have $\frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r} + \frac{12}{35}\varepsilon_a < \frac{1}{2}$. Hence, $\frac{\varepsilon_a}{\varepsilon_r} + \varepsilon_a < \frac{1}{2} + \frac{23}{35}\varepsilon_a < \frac{1}{2} + \frac{23}{35} \times \frac{35}{94} < 1$. As a result, $\varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_r\varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_r < 0$, leading to $\nu < 0$. It follows that $\tau \leq -1$ and thus the sample sizes $n_1, \dots, n_s$ are well-defined. By Lemma 17, the sampling must stop at some stage with index $\ell \in \{1, \dots, s\}$. Therefore, the sampling scheme is well-defined. By Lemmas 18, 19 and the definition of the stopping rule, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \{ |\hat{\mathbf{p}} - p| \geq \varepsilon_a, |\hat{\mathbf{p}} - p| \geq \varepsilon_r p \} &= \Pr \{ p \leq \underline{\mathbf{p}} \} + \Pr \{ p \geq \bar{\mathbf{p}} \} \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell=1}^s \Pr \{ p \leq \underline{\mathbf{p}}_\ell, S_B(K_\ell, n_\ell, n_\ell, \underline{\mathbf{p}}_\ell) \leq \zeta\delta \} \\ &\quad + \sum_{\ell=1}^s \Pr \{ p \geq \bar{\mathbf{p}}_\ell, S_B(0, K_\ell, n_\ell, \bar{\mathbf{p}}_\ell) \leq \zeta\delta \} \\ &\leq s\zeta\delta + s\zeta\delta = 2s\zeta\delta \leq 2(1-\tau)\delta, \end{aligned}$$

from which it can be seen that $\Pr \{ |\hat{\mathbf{p}} - p| < \varepsilon_a \text{ or } |\hat{\mathbf{p}} - p| < \varepsilon_r p \} > 1 - \delta$ if $0 < \zeta < \frac{1}{2(1-\tau)}$. This concludes the proof of Theorem 4.

D Proof of Theorem 5

To prove the theorem, we need to introduce function

$$\mathcal{M}_P(z, \lambda) = \begin{cases} z - \lambda + z \ln \frac{\lambda}{z} & \text{for } z > 0 \text{ and } \lambda > 0, \\ -\lambda & \text{for } z = 0 \text{ and } \lambda > 0, \\ -\infty & \text{for } z \geq 0 \text{ and } \lambda \leq 0. \end{cases}$$

We need some preliminary results as follows. The following results, stated as Lemma 20, has been established by Chen in [1].

Lemma 20 $S_P(0, k, n, \lambda) \leq \exp(n\mathcal{M}_P(\frac{k}{n}, \lambda))$ for $0 \leq k \leq n\lambda$. Similarly, $S_P(k, \infty, n, \lambda) \leq \exp(n\mathcal{M}_P(\frac{k}{n}, \lambda))$ for $k \geq n\lambda$.

Lemma 21 Let $K = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ where $X_1, \dots, X_n$ are i.i.d. Poisson random variables with mean λ . Then, $\Pr\{S_P(0, K, n, \lambda) \leq \alpha\} \leq \alpha$ for any $\alpha > 0$.

Proof. If $\{S_P(0, K, n, \lambda) \leq \alpha\}$ is an impossible event, then $\Pr\{S_P(0, K, n, \lambda) \leq \alpha\} = 0 < \alpha$. Otherwise, if $\{S_P(0, K, n, \lambda) \leq \alpha\}$ is a possible event, then there exists an integer $k^* = \max\{k : k \geq 0, S_P(0, k, n, \lambda) \leq \alpha\}$ and it follows that $\Pr\{S_P(0, K, n, \lambda) \leq \alpha\} = S_P(0, k^*, n, \lambda) \leq \alpha$. The proof is thus completed. $\square$

Lemma 22 Let $K = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ where $X_1, \dots, X_n$ are i.i.d. Poisson random variables with mean λ . Then, $\Pr\{S_P(K, \infty, n, \lambda) \leq \alpha\} \leq \alpha$ for any $\alpha > 0$.

Proof. Since $\{S_P(K, \infty, n, \lambda) \leq \alpha\}$ is a possible event for any $\alpha > 0$, there exists an integer $k_* = \min\{k : k \geq 0, S_P(k, \infty, n, \lambda) \leq \alpha\}$ and it follows that $\Pr\{S_P(K, \infty, n, \lambda) \leq \alpha\} = S_P(k_*, \infty, n, \lambda) \leq \alpha$. The proof is thus completed. $\square$

The following result, stated as Lemma 23, has been established by Chen in [1].

Lemma 23 $\Pr\left\{\mathcal{M}_P(\hat{\lambda}_s, \underline{\lambda}_s) \leq \frac{\ln(\zeta\delta)}{n_s}, \mathcal{M}_P(\hat{\lambda}_s, \bar{\lambda}_s) \leq \frac{\ln(\zeta\delta)}{n_s}\right\} = 1$.

Lemma 24 $\Pr\{S_P(0, K_s - 1, n_s, \underline{\lambda}_s) \geq 1 - \zeta\delta\} = \Pr\{S_P(0, K_s, n_s, \bar{\lambda}_s) \leq \zeta\delta\} = 1$.

Proof. By Lemmas 20 and 23,

$$1 \geq \Pr\{S_P(0, K_s - 1, n_s, \underline{\lambda}_s) \geq 1 - \zeta\delta\} = \Pr\{S_P(K_s, \infty, n_s, \underline{\lambda}_s) \leq \zeta\delta\} \geq \Pr\left\{\mathcal{M}_P(\hat{\lambda}_s, \underline{\lambda}_s) \leq \frac{\ln(\zeta\delta)}{n_s}\right\} = 1,$$

$$1 \geq \Pr\{S_P(0, K_s, n_s, \bar{\lambda}_s) \leq \zeta\delta\} \geq \Pr\left\{\mathcal{M}_P(\hat{\lambda}_s, \bar{\lambda}_s) \leq \frac{\ln(\zeta\delta)}{n_s}\right\} = 1.$$

The lemma immediately follows. $\square$

By a similar argument as that of Lemma 7, we have Lemma 25 as follows.

Lemma 25 $\Pr\{\lambda \leq \underline{\lambda}_\ell, S_P(K_\ell, \infty, n_\ell, \underline{\lambda}_\ell) \leq \zeta\delta\} \leq \zeta\delta$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, s$.

By a similar argument as that of Lemma 8, we have Lemma 26 as follows.

Lemma 26 $\Pr\{\lambda \geq \bar{\lambda}_\ell, S_P(0, K_\ell, n_\ell, \bar{\lambda}_\ell) \leq \zeta\delta\} \leq \zeta\delta$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, s$.

Now we are in a position to prove Theorem 5. Since $\frac{\varepsilon_r}{1+\varepsilon_r} < \ln(1+\varepsilon_r) < \varepsilon_r$ for $\varepsilon_r \in (0, 1)$, we have $0 < (1+\varepsilon_r)\ln(1+\varepsilon_r) - \varepsilon_r < \varepsilon_r^2$ and thus $\nu > \frac{1}{\varepsilon_a \varepsilon_r} > 1$ for $\varepsilon_a, \varepsilon_r \in (0, 1)$. It follows that $\tau \geq 1$ and thus the sample sizes $n_1, \dots, n_s$ are well-defined. By Lemma 24, the sampling must stop at some stage with index $\ell \in \{1, \dots, s\}$. Therefore, the sampling scheme is well-defined. By Lemmas 25, 26 and the definition of the stopping rule, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\{|\hat{\lambda} - \lambda| \geq \varepsilon_a, |\hat{\lambda} - \lambda| \geq \varepsilon_r \lambda\} &= \Pr\{\lambda \leq \underline{\lambda}\} + \Pr\{\lambda \geq \bar{\lambda}\} \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell=1}^s \Pr\{\lambda \leq \underline{\lambda}_\ell, S_B(0, K_\ell - 1, n_\ell, \underline{\lambda}_\ell) \geq 1 - \zeta\delta\} \\ &\quad + \sum_{\ell=1}^s \Pr\{\lambda \geq \bar{\lambda}_\ell, S_B(0, K_\ell, n_\ell, \bar{\lambda}_\ell) \leq \zeta\delta\} \\ &\leq s\zeta\delta + s\zeta\delta = 2s\zeta\delta \leq 2(\tau + 1)\delta, \end{aligned}$$

from which it can be seen that $\Pr\{|\hat{\lambda} - \lambda| < \varepsilon_a \text{ or } |\hat{\lambda} - \lambda| < \varepsilon_r \lambda\} > 1 - \delta$ if $0 < \zeta < \frac{1}{2(\tau+1)}$. This concludes the proof of Theorem 5.

References

- [1] X. Chen, “A new framework of multistage estimation,” arXiv:0809.1241v5 [math.ST], January 2009.
- [2] X. Chen, “A truncation approach for fast computation of distribution functions,” arXiv:0802.3455 [math.ST], February 2008.
- [3] M. Ghosh, N. Mukhopadhyay and P. K. Sen, *Sequential Estimation*, Wiley, New York, 1997.
- [4] W. Hoeffding, “Probability inequalities for sums of bounded variables,” *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, vol. 58, pp. 13–29, 1963.
- [5] N. L. Johnson, A. W. Kemp and S. Kotz, *Univariate Discrete Distributions*, Wiley-Interscience, 2005.
- [6] H. Sahai and A. Khurshid, “Confidence intervals for the probability of success in the binomial distribution: a review,” *Metron*, vol. 54, pp. 153–180, 1996.
- [7] H. Sahai and A. Khurshid, “Confidence intervals for the mean of a Poisson distribution: a review,” *Biometrical Journal*, vol. 35, pp. 857–867, 1993.